

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Jennifer Jones,)	
)	C/A No.: 0:06-1441-MBS
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	OPINION AND ORDER
Michael J. Astrue, Commissioner of)	
Social Security,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

Plaintiff Jennifer Jones filed applications for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income, alleging disability commencing September 12, 2001 because of seizure disorder and tension-type headaches. The applications were denied initially and upon reconsideration. Plaintiff requested a hearing before an administrative law judge (“ALJ”). The ALJ held a hearing on January 19, 2006. On March 2, 2006, the ALJ issued a decision that Plaintiff was not entitled to supplemental security income under section 1614(a)(3)(A) of the Social Security Act. The decision of the ALJ became the “final decision” of the Commissioner on April 20, 2006, after the Appeals Council determined that there was no basis for granting Plaintiff’s request for review. Plaintiff thereafter brought the within action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), seeking judicial review of the “final decision” of the Commissioner.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02, D.S.C., this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Bristow Marchant. On June 4, 2007, the Magistrate Judge filed a Report and Recommendation in which he found that the record contained substantial evidence to support the conclusions of the Commissioner. Accordingly, the Magistrate Judge recommended that the decision of the Commissioner be affirmed. No party filed objections to the Report of Magistrate

Judge.

The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portions of the Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or may recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). In the absence of objections to the Report, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case, the court adopts the Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein by reference. The record contains substantial evidence to support the conclusion of the Commissioner that Plaintiff was not disabled within the meaning of the Social Security Act during the relevant time period. The Commissioner's decision therefore is **affirmed**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Margaret B. Seymour
United States District Judge

Columbia, South Carolina

July 5, 2007.